

REMARKS

The Examiner rejects previous claims 65, 67-70, 73, and 76 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Kadowaki. Claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Kadowaki further in view of White. Claims 71-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Kadowaki further in view of Colby. Claims 74-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Kadowaki further in view of Naito.

New claims are presented which are drawn to clearly distinguish over the cited references and particularly the Kadowaki primary reference.

First, claim 77 recites that the at least one operating unit is connected via an external network connection with the first apparatus which is a printing or copying apparatus. Kadowaki does not show this operating unit inside the printer 1.

Secondly, claim 77 distinguishes at least by reciting a first control unit of the first printing or copying apparatus which comprises a control panel server. This feature is also not present since Kadowaki does not show a control panel server but only a personalizing server 3 which is not part of the first control unit.

Thirdly, claim 77 recites graphical elements of a graphical user interface being stored in a memory of the first printing or copying apparatus, the graphical elements being transferred into the at least one operating unit and loaded there for display. This feature is also not shown in Kadowaki and is newly recited in new claim 77.

Finally, claim 77 distinguishes at least by reciting that the control panel server in the first printing or copying apparatus is connected via an internal network connection with a network agent via which a data exchange takes place with a plurality of sub-controllers. This data exchange for the plurality of sub-controllers is not shown in Kadowaki, and Kadowaki does not show the sub-controllers.

For the above reasons, either singly or in combination, claim 77 readily distinguishes over the newly cited Kadowaki primary reference.

The secondary references do not satisfy the deficiencies of the primary reference.

Dependent claims 78-91 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 77 and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

Independent method claim 92 distinguishes for the same reasons noted above in independent claim 77.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Respectfully submitted,



(Reg. No. 27,841)

Brett A. Valiquet

SCHIFF HARDIN LLP

Patent Department - **CUSTOMER NO. 26574**

6600 Sears Tower 233 South Wacker Drive

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 258-5786

Attorneys for Applicant